6/19/68

Dear Hal,

Further response to your letter of 6/15. I have forwarded what shouldbe.

Have any of you checked out the Sirhan Cuban connection?

It is hard to believe that those photographed in front of TSBD, who certainly know the photographs exist, would risk a second exposure, unless they are a very small, not connected band. Or expected incredible protection.

Chapman, who has been hiding from me what I have known all along, that he is violently anti-Semitic, has not responded to my last two letters. I think it best that I leave him alone for a while. I did not know this originated with you. Jim had told me. Possibly I asked Chapman for what gets too close to some of his close friends. None of this influences the validity of the pictures he took for me that, unfortunately, were so misused.

I agree it is possible the real killer disappeared in that church. I also agree that he may then have fled to New Orleans, and I have something bearing on this that I cannot put in the mail. Hence I would be more than interested in any other conjecture or fact you may have on this. I have reason to think it possible that people involved in that assassination were in New Orleans the Sunday night following. Amplication, what little there is, will have to await our meeting. Nothing firm in my plans yet. Questions remains money and housing. I have neither the fare nor the arrangements and will not, under any circumstances, be able to stay in a motel. Not all the time, anyway.

Lifton had sent me his mailing. I didn't order because I had two of the things, one of which he doesn't understand and the other he misrepresents. The Marina interrogation, which I discovered (not "recently", in his use of Thompson's dodge, but about May of 1966 and published in essence in WWII), is hardly worth this attention, particularly when compared with theother documents that could be published in that space, and makes me again wonder what his unneath real intents now are. His work on Thornley is quite dishonest. I have sent Paul copies of my letter on each article. I did not say all I could have. One of the fascinating things is the open lie that is repeated, that Thornley was back in New Orleans for only two weeks in September before O left. I am satisfied this is a lie, Without checking my files, it otherwise means Thornley had a much longer stay in Mexico. I know he was there 7/31/63. I have letters he wrote then, before and after, with envelopes. He could not account for the period immediately before those two September weeks when Jim asked him. I find significance in your correspondence and his opening clause, for this was before publication of O in NO and if he had thought of the significance of O(s crypto clearance before that he knew things he has not disclosed, knows his testimony is at best misleading. I think I have told Paul a little about what I have learned of him. His use of P.O. boxes when he seems to have had no need to is also fascinating. That fitsk a pattern of not him and O only. Layton Martens, for example, has one yet he has a permanent residence. I have reason to believe he also has interestinf connections.

Nothing to add to my yesterday comment on the rumors and broadcasts. I thinjk everyone was quoting my information, with a little of it getting garbled, like Lind and Harris getting confused as "emmisaries". I doubt Jones was, not that Hay. He has a hunk of a boxer who fought that weekend, in N.O. (got robbed).

I have new stuff if any of the fellows would like to air me by phone (I'd love an engagement that would pay so I could get out there to speak to all of you). I now charge and prove that what Life actually bought from Z was the right to suppress his film. I have evolved a way of using the film that is suit-proof and

have done it on a number of local TV stations and at least one press conference without comment from Life. I add to this the content of the nine missing frames of stills, 335-43, suppressed in the printing and use of the stills, and it makes an exciting show. The info is solid. These missing frames again disprove the accounting of the shooting. They clearly show the back of the head, the collars, and there is no blood on the neck of the shirt collar. Lane is, as usual, just whoring around when he says there is a simultaneous backward and leftward motion beginning at 313. There are two separate motions, and the body pivots first, toward the right. It is here that the back of the neck and the collars are so visible. Also, the head flap seems inconsistent with the explanation of the wound. It is much farthur to the front and blocks from the camera view of his face, in these "missing" frames. They reacted to PW, where I go into this in the early pages, and quietly slipped those frames in. They published only to 334.

I wonder whether using that "too many guns" bit in connection with an emmissary was a good idea. I wonder whether this dribbling of what should not be mentioned if there are every to be approaches from those fearing repurcusions will not discourage any of the entourage who might be so inclined. For the sake of cheap attention to what he deserves no attention for, Mark has again set us back, as invaryingly he does. After this, I doubt if anyone not desparate or incredibly dedicated will get in touch with Garrison. If he is worried about his life, should he?

Regards to everyone. I'll send Paul the Radelot docs, etc., when I get them. I did order them and should have them in a few days.

Sincerely,